

Notes on Nietzsche in Relation to Space Between and the Meta-Rational

Nietzsche reacts to an “antiseptic” society, numbed by Christian piety into a lack of awareness of its own lambasted and disowned instincts. What would Nietzsche say about twentieth century America, which (in its higher, “controlling” sectors) lurched forward by its mechanism of “all instinct,” but instinct in its most crass, strong-stomach-and-iron-willed towards material progress and dominion form? This is a milieu in which, just by dint of sensitive and nuanced cognition, Nietzsche himself becomes a Christian and (owing to the extremity of his vision’s breadth and positivity) a saint. Twentieth century America, in other words, turned Nietzsche on his head (as much or more than the Nazis did) by “out-willing” him, manifesting “killer instincts” so far removed from pity (but also from intellection) that it is difficult to imagine a Nietzsche who could condone a culture so steeped in amorality and immorality, and brutish in its will to material, “apparent” power.

Nietzsche’s profound moral center: that he bothered to care (against Schopenhauer) for the possibilities and fate of the human race, and that the excesses of his intellectual depth (or depths) made the meta-rational link from the Greek spirit of the Dionysian to its use as palliative against Christian piety and idolatry— but, twentieth century America took the Dionysian to its farthest extreme by espousing the orgiastic against intellection— Nietzsche never stipulates that his conception of will should eschew “idea” and pure ideality completely— his own self-contained discourses (its self-denied and denying dialectics) did not (could not, in a self-respecting manner) disavow high levels of subtlety and artifice— the America of no-subtlety and no-artifice made of discourse (usually institutionalized) a necessary repository for saintliness— even, broadly speaking, the process of “reading” became a repository for formalist and baroque or simple “religiosity,” a caricature of Nietzschean “instincts” and heroic anti-morality— we know what Nietzsche made of European clerics and clerisy— what would he have made of American con artists, drug dealing pimps, and self-proclaimed uber-mensch demagogues, with or against its Academy?

The American anti-clerisy of the twentieth century were certainly “clean” of morality, and beyond notions of moral good and evil— but the twenty-first century is a new context, and (willy-nilly) in many ways the twentieth century was Nietzsche’s— the acknowledgement of Space Between, its hinge to the possibilities of the meta-rational (“linkage,” vertical movement of the “souled,” both by instinct and intellection) negates the first context in an American dialectic of centuries— possibly, even, the next century will enact a kind of synthesis (the twenty-second century)— but no American who cares about the “health” of instincts can take Nietzsche’s conceptions seriously in 2013. Nietzsche’s sloppiness, his lack of practical insight (what does the uber-mensch rise from his sleep every morning and *do?*), and his own will’s facility in textually extending his rhetorical positions with the florid grandiosity of a mad adolescent centaur firing off arrows in all directions.

One inversion to stipulate about twentieth century America— Europeans attributed to it extraordinary brutishness, in its crass consumerist materialism— this is true— but it is also true, that in its political and commercial duplicity, its evasions, decoys, and fraudulent appearances, America displayed greatly cunning subtlety. America, in other words, did manifest intellection, but it was misplaced into channels whose *telos* was material profit for its own sake. Strictly speaking, high sector America told the truth about nothing— everything

and everyone was fair game to be decoyed. Twentieth century America's will to power was not solely one-dimensional and naïve; European intellectuals who interpreted it that way were cruelly deceived. Yet, on both levels (overt and covert) American will to power was diseased with unclean and unhealthy instincts— amorality and immorality taken to such extremes as (this bears repeating) to make a saint of Nietzsche or anyone whose cognition was meant to serve both anti-material (spiritual) and meta-rational ends.

Space Between as a gestalt ontological form in relation to America— an entity or self-subsistent “geist” which cannot be “decoyed” the way Nietzschean discourses can— because, especially in conjunction with *Dasein*, it creates a context of positivity in ontological space, and in the ontological space before active and action-oriented cognition; its commensurate active practice is (firstly) the pursuit, for individuals, of the development of “souled” consciousness— explorations of the processes in and “around” individuation, subjectivity, and difference— an open invitation to introspection, rather than a wild, easily misconstrued and manipulated construct of linguistic signs still steeped in the adolescent romanticism of the half-artistic and the half-philosophical.

Adam Fieled, 2013